

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-17, 19-22, and 24-34 are currently pending in the application. Independent claims 1, 21 and 34 and dependent claim 20 have been amended.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 19-22 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 21 have been amended to recite that the control and command unit compares electrical signals, from the image acquiring device, with standard data and if any differences are detected, the control and command unit sends electrical signals to the support and at least one printing body in order to modify their angular speeds and torque moments to correct the differences. Support for this feature can be found in the specification at least at paragraph [0056]. Specifically, claim 1, as amended recites “an image acquiring device operatively connected to said control and command unit, said image acquiring device constantly monitoring said non-woven fabric in order to detect the presence of creases or variations in the printing with respect to a preset standard, wherein said image acquiring device acquires an image of said non-woven fabric and sends electrical signals representative of said acquired image to said control and command unit and wherein said control and command unit detects electrical signals originating from said image acquiring device, compares said electrical signals with standard data stored in said control and command unit, and if any differences are detected, said control and command unit sends electrical signals to said support and at least one printing body in order to modify their respective angular speeds and torque moments to correct said differences.”

The above-described features of the invention are not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references. Newly cited reference Hunt et al. discloses a quality control analysis means that detects defects or other characteristics of the web and notes the location of such defects. Col. 4, lines 16-18. The claimed invention, however, not only detects defects (by, for example, comparing the image detected by the image acquiring device to the text or drawing which is supposed to be reproduced on the web), but also sends electrical signals to change the angular speed or torque

moment of the printing bodies if any differences are detected. In contrast, Hunt only detects defects and does not alter the speed of printing bodies in response to detecting defects. Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest the limitations of independent claims 1 and 21.

Since the Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. combination does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 21, claims 1 and 21 are not obvious over the cited references. Claims 2, 4, 7, 19-20, 22 and 31-33 depend from claims 1 and 21 and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, 15-16 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al., and further in view of Takahashi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 5-6, 8-9, and 15-16 and claims 24-26 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are patentable over Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. for at least the reasons mentioned above. Claim 34 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1 and is allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Takahashi, which has been cited as teaching a printer having a driven support provided with through holes which cooperate with holding means, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 10-14 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al., Hunt et al., and Takahashi, and further in view of Deeming et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-14 and claim 27 depend from independent claims 1 and 21, respectively, and are patentable over the Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al., Hunt et al. and Takahashi combination for at least the reasons mentioned above. Deeming, which has been cited as teaching transporting fabric on a belt through which water can be separated by a vacuum, does not cure the deficiencies of

Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al., Hunt et al and Takahashi discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 17 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al., Hunt et al., and Takahashi, and further in view of Kurihara et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 17 and 30 depend from independent claims 1 and 30, respectively, and are patentable over the Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al., Hunt et al. and Takahashi combination for at least the reasons mentioned above. Kurihara, which has been cited as teaching a widening function, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al., Hunt et al. and Takahashi discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al., and further in view of Darel et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 depends from independent claim 21 and is patentable over Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. for at least the reasons mentioned above. Darel et al., which has been cited as teaching a printer having an image acquiring device, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza et al., Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 29 allowed.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al., Hunt et al., and Takahashi. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 34 has been amended to recite the same features as independent claims 1 and 21, and is patentable over Cattaruzza et al. in view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. for at least the reasons mentioned above. Takahashi, which has been cited as teaching a printer having a driven support that is provided with through holes, does not cure the deficiencies of Cattaruzza et al. in

view of Gotanda et al. and Hunt et al. discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and that claim 34 be allowed.

In view of the above, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Stephen A. Soffen

Registration No. 31,063

Amy Kuo Ames

Registration No. 62,374

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants